

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **June 3, 2004**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-21. Claims 1-8 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Wical (USPN 6,112,201, hereinafter “Wical”). Claim 9 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wical. Claims 10-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wical in view of Shima et al. (USPN 5,835,922, hereinafter “Shima”). Claims 14 and 17-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wical in view of Mortimer et al. (USPN 6,091,930, hereinafter “Mortimer”). Claims 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wical in view of Mortimer and in further view of Shima.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Wical. Additionally, independent claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wical. Furthermore, independent claims 14 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wical in view of Mortimer.

Applicant respectfully points out that the present invention is directed to identifying a set of topics based on the chapter and section headings (see page 6, lines 25-27, page 7, lines 7-17, FIG. 2, 206). Moreover, the present invention is directed to **a method for classifying** the topics into a set of categories **and organizing** the topics into a hierarchical structure that is stored in a database (see page 3, lines 22-23, page 7, lines 7-17, page 9, lines 13-16, page 10, lines 15-27, page 11, lines 1-18, FIG. 2, 212, 214).

In contrast, Wical is directed to providing a way to browse and locate information **that has already been classified and organized** in a hierarchical structure (see Abstract, lines 1-3). Specifically, Wical teaches that the user of the

virtual bookshelf “*browses the hierarchical structure to view categories for the source documents*” (see col. 5, lines 38-40).

Applicant respectfully points out that there is nothing in Wical, Shima, or Mortimer, either explicit or implicit, which specifies a system for classifying topics into a set of hierarchical categories, wherein the topics are based on the chapter and section headings.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 14, 15, and 17 to further specify that the set of topics is based on the chapter and section headings in the documentation. These claim amendments find support on page 3, lines 22-23, page 6, lines 25-27, page 7, lines 7-17, page 9, lines 13-16, page 10, lines 15-27, page 11, lines 1-18, FIG. 2, 206, 212, 214. Moreover, Applicant has canceled claim 16 without prejudice.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 14, 15, and 17 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-13, which depend upon claim 1, and claims 18-21, which depend upon claim 17, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By



A. Richard Park

Registration No. 41,241

Date: July 6, 2004

A. Richard Park
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
508 Second Street, Suite 201
Davis, CA 95616-4692
Tel: (530) 759-1661
FAX: (530) 759-1665